

(quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

Plaintiffs did not object to the M&R. Therefore, the court reviews for clear error. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See id.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R (except about the Rooker-Feldman doctrine) [D.E. 15] and DISMISSES WITH PREJUDICE plaintiffs’ complaint as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 19 day of December, 2024.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge